DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 636 CE 014 123

AUTHOR	Wills, Joan
TITLE	Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R & D. Occasional Paper No. 32.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Nov 77
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Vocational Education Publications, Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($1.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperative Planning; *Educational Coordination; Educational Responsibility; *Employment Problems; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Interagency Cooperation; Interagency Coordination; Relevance (Education); School Role; *Vocational Education; Youth; *Youth Employment; Youth Problems; Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

Has vocational education been responsible for the unemployed youth in our nation today? No, the vocational education community is not responsible for youth unemployment rates, the shifting labor market demands, the baby bulge, women in the labor force, the oil embargo, or the economic recession. Then what role does the vocational education community have for the unemployed youth of our nation? The answer is none. Neither the network of secondary and postsecondary schools, grade school career exploration, nor the vocational education system can create jobs. The vocational education community can be one of many institutions reacting positively to the conditions causing youth unemployment. However, claims to do more than what is possible are damaging to all the actors. The recently enacted youth legislation is a product of too many promises. Vocational education must be cautious about claiming the ability to deliver the variety of services these youth may need. Vocational education must decide some basic directions, be coordinated, and work with other agencies to change the statistics of youth unemployment. (The author's answers to ten questions from the audience of vocational education research and development personnel are appended.) (EM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147636

Occasional Paper No. 32

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT:

IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R & D

by

Joan Wills

Director
National Governors' Conference Employment and
Vocational Training Program

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel H. Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

November 1977

CE 014 123

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

PREFACE

The Center and the Ohio State University welcomed a presentation by Ms. Joan Wills, director of the National Governors' Conference Employment and Vocational Training Program, entitled "Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R & D." In her speech, she depicts the responsibilities to youth that vocational education R & D must deal with now and in the future. She discussed in detail the role that vocational R & D must fulfill in meeting the needs of unemployed youth.

As director of the National Governors' Conference Employment and Vocational Training Program, Ms. Wills serves as a liaison between governors and the Congress, the Administration, and selected national associations on issues dealing with employment and vocational training.

She has also worked for two governors in Ohio and Illinois in various capacities, one as the director of the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development in Illinois.

Other experiences include work within the local community in Columbus, Ohio, for a community action agency, the United Appeal organization.

Ms. Wills has a master's degree in social work from The Ohio State University.

She has received various awards and citations for her work with the poor and disadvantaged.

On behalf of The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational Education, we take pleasure in sharing with you Ms. Wills' presentation, "Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R & D."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The Center for Vocational Education

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R & D

The question in the title of this speech deserves an answer at the outset. Yes and no. Such an answer is hopefully worthy of the accolades of a successful politician, a good bureaucrat, a respected economist, or a certified academic social science researcher. If one listens carefully to the representatives of these professions, the common thread of their pronouncements and writings is reflected in the cliches: "All things are relative," or "On the other hand," or "The findings indicate that empirical evidence would suggest," and they have not answered the question. Has vocational education been responsible for the unemployed youth in our nation today?

Nonpositive responses are always easier to articulate than positive ones, so let me begin my explanation to the question invented for the title of this talk today in the following nonpositive manner. (What I am about to say may be obvious to you in Columbus, Ohio, but it is not my perception that it is obvious to some people east of the Potomic River in an area surrounded by Virginia and Maryland.)

No, the vocational education community is not responsible for the official August 1977 15.3 percent youth unemployment rate. Nor is it responsible for the Black youth unemployment rate of 40.3 percent during the same month. The vocational education community may not have fulfilled its maximum capability by helping to reduce the disparity between the two statistics just quoted, but vocational education is not responsible for the figures.

No, the vocational community is not responsible for the often quoted macro statistics which indicate the students graduating from our high schools and colleges are not what they need to be for the ever shifting demands of the adult labor market.

No, the vocational education community is not responsible for the baby bulge of the post war era, the increased participation of women in the labor force, the oil embargo, or the current economic recession.

If the vocational education community is not responsible for the just mentioned macro social and economic issues, then the question follows "What, if any, role does the vocational education community have for the unemployed youth of our nation?" Let me pose an answer. None. Neither the network of schools at the secondary and postsecondary level, the experiments in grade school level career exploration, nor the vocational education system can create jobs in the public or private sector. The system cannot affect international policy to prevent oil embargos; the system cannot second guess Congress on the vote of the B-1 bomber to know how many jobs North American Rockwell will have in a California plant. The vocational education community cannot alter the fact that more women are entering the labor force because families need additional income or the forces of influence bubbling up from the women's liberation movement. Boarded up businesses entombing the canyons of concrete in our ghettos need more inducement to reopen than increased funding for vocational education will influence. The system cannot resolve the debate for or against a subminimum wage for youth.

I suggest this is an answer that must be in the forefront of our minds during the rest of this discussion. Accept momentarily, if you would, my assumption that the vocational education community can at its best then, be one of many institutional reactors to the conditions causing youth unemployment. Reactors can be creative and proactive but reactors to conditions nontneless.

To react in a positive fashion to a given problem one must be able to define what one can do best and then do it. Claims to do more than that are damaging to all the actors.

Let us review a specific legislative example which illustrates the need for caution. The recently enacted and soon to be implemented youth legislation is a product of too many promises by too many people and too many institutions for too many years. The $1.5 billion earmarked through amendments to the comprehensive employment and training act (CETA) is an outgrowth of no less than thirty-seven different bills drafted in Congress, thirty-seven bills drafted within four weeks, trying to address an announcement by the President prior to his inauguration that: Youth would be singled out as a specific population within his overall economic stimulus proposal.

During the transition period of the presidency many option papers were written focusing on the possible institutional delivery mechanisms appropriate to implement an undefined set of programs. Early in that debate there were strong advocates suggesting the best strategy to be an increase in federal aid to schools, specifically vocational education schools. The argument, no doubt familiar to many in the room, was based on the theory that schooling worthy unto itself can also perform the function of delaying entry into the labor force and thereby indirectly produce a reduced unemployment rate. It was also stated that more money would produce better vocational education to serve the kids who leave school without marketable skills.

Other proposals included a national para military type of Youth Action Corps. Some suggested expansion of the Youth Conservation Corps. Others wanted to place youth in short-term construction jobs; others called for an expansion of funding under already enacted titles of the CETA legislation and on and on, the solutions were proposed.

The legislation debate prior to the culmination of the new act focused primarily on the following set of principles articulated by Minnesota State Senator David Kennedy in a 1972 article for the Public Administration Review. The article title was "The Law of Appropriateness: An Approach to a General Theory of Intergovernmental Relations." After years of observing our federal, state, and local governmental structures, the senator developed these following laws which, for him, have proven immutable:

- The level of government most appropriate to deal with a given problem is that level by which one is presently employed.
- Other levels of government are basically untrustworthy and require constant supervision and observation.
- Duplication of program efforts at various levels is not wasteful or inefficient but, rather, is essential to the preservations of the intergovernmental system.
- The level of government most appropriate to finance any given governmental program is a level other than that by whom one is presently employed.

Such laws, I submit to you, were the essence of the debate prior to the passage of the youth legislation and obviously again proved to be immutable. The following examples are cited as proof: Eight federal agencies and multiple bureaus and divisions within those agencies will be involved in the implementation; state government by a special role and city and counties of specific size have many lead responsibilities; local education agencies have special guaranteed set asides (it is yet undetermined which legal definition of LEA's will be used); union interests are protected; community based organizations fortunate enough to have national staff to advocate for them have been given "special consideration status," as have the veterans.

This type of analysis of the new legislation is perhaps too cynical. There was a thread throughout the debate which attempted to focus on substance—what age groups should receive priority, what specific socio-economic population should be served, how best to bridge the gap between school and world of work. The result, perhaps by accident, is there is an opportunity to experiment on ways to maximize the boundless resource of our youth. The concepts so well articulated by Willard Wirtz have been incorporated.

Congress, perhaps wisely, reflected appropriate caution in light of the turmoil surrounding the ultimate passage of this new legislation. Generally, the act has a one-year life. The whole is considered a test. The title "Youth Employment and *Demonstration* Act," was carefully worded. This reflects wisely that no one structure, no one solution is present today.

Caution, rather than arrogance in rhetoric, is reflected in the Department of Labor planning charter just released for the new youth act. The document says: "At the most elementary level, priorities must be assigned to the basic goals of the YEDPA, which in some ways conflict with one another. The act seeks both increased employment for youth and increased preparation for later employment. The greatest number of jobs can be created when wages are low, hours limited, services and supervision held to a minimum."

Employability development involves training and other services, more structured work settings with heavier supervision and support: In other words, higher unit costs and fewer jobs. It is necessary to strike a balance between immediate employment and longer-term employability development.

The act is intended to coordinate and improve the quality of career development, employment, and training services currently available for youth. Institutional change is a time-consuming process requiring careful planning and a measured approach. A choice must be made between rapid implementation to achieve immediate employment impacts, and a more careful implementation to achieve long-term coordination and change. Quality in programs is difficult to enforce, and efforts to promote and monitor qualitative improvements complicate administration. How much priority should be given to doing new and different things, or changing what exists, as opposed to expanding efforts of demonstrated if not maximal value?

This is a "Demonstration Projects" act, emphasizing research and experimentation because Congress does not believe it has the knowledge and information to set long-term policies. Carefully structured experiments take time. Technical rigor and discipline usually conflict with operational expediency. A balance must, therefore, be reached in determining how much emphasis should be placed on the varied goals of employment, employability development, reform, and experimentation.

The $1.5 billion annual spending level planned for YEDPA augments, but hardly outweighs, what is already being spent. Other outlays for employment-related programs are almost ten times greater. The $1.5 billion represents roughly $50 per youth, age 14-21, or $600 per unemployed youth. It can create only around a quarter of a million full-time minimum wage jobs, even if services and overhead are minimized. This would employ only a tenth of jobless youth.

Let us now turn back to what impact all this has on the vocational education community, in particular the research component.

Specifics are not at my fingertips. To stand before you today and provide no more of an answer than this was originally troublesome to me. Yet it is truthful. One piece of legislation, serving

at best 200,000 youth, is not our nation's answer. The resources of all the varying training funds need to be focused. The resource array is impressive, which Charles Buzzel has appropriately pointed out. Forty billion dollars a year in private industry; $10 billion by the Department of Defense, $40 billion total in higher education, $3 billion of which is federal, $1.5 billion in Title I of CETA, $600 million federal funds for vocational education, multiplied more than six fold by state and local fiscal resources. This is not the whole. If we but could energize ourselves collectively we could stop pointing fingers at one another and help each young person seek and reach his or her own maximum potential.

As I noted earlier it is always easier to say what institutions cannot do particularly when one is on the outside looking in. Vocational education can and must make such positive contributions.

We're beginning to get a profile of the unemployed youth—and many of them are young people with multiple problems, a lack of marketable skills being only one. Vocational education can be part of the solution, but as I have said, vocational education should be cautious about claiming the ability to deliver the variety of services these youth may need. Vocational educators need to decide some very basic directions: Are traditional vocational education programs geared to meet the needs of unwed mothers? Do you really think you can resolve all of the problems of drug addicted, inner city kids? What can vocational education do, even with increased funds, to change the inability of recent immigrants or ghetto youth to speak the Business English employers insist they need? How do vocational educators plan to enforce requirements that handicapped youth get equal opportunity in the labor market?

Vocational education must be coordinated—the word has become trite—vocational education must *work with* the other existing services to meet the needs of unemployed youth. All of education, and particularly vocational education, must assume responsibility to work with other agencies to change the statistics of youth unemployment. For example, the increase in numbers of young women entering the labor market cannot be considered the responsibility of vocational education, but the level of employment for which young women are prepared can be improved by increased encouragement from teachers to learn nontraditional skills. The largest numbers of unemployed youth are those who have traditionally had difficulty accepting and being accepted by our primary institutions, schools included. The youth legislation, and the Education Amendments of 1976, should suggest to all of those concerned with service delivery, including the vocational education community, that we all have a role and a responsibility but that we are going to have to work together, if we are going to accept the challenge and the responsibilities of change.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. How do we get the various levels of government and agencies to work or coordinate to ensure that an improved program of education be realized? What is the answer? Can you cite a situation where coordination is happening?

Unfortunately I cannot cite any situation. I can cite examples of coordination and cooperation at the local level and the state government level.

I think the pluralism in America is that when different agents are expected to intervene and provide service to an individual, the term coordination probably ends up being our greatest impediment.

Now let me try to explain what I mean. We long ago established that government should finance and support a free public education system and should perform this intermediary function for a very early age group. But, in the employment and training programs, government only intervenes, or it has been decided by social policy that government should only intervene, when there is something dysfunctional with (1) either the individual and (2) or the economy as a whole. We have had difficulty making up our minds whether we're intervening because there's something wrong with the individual and/or the economy as a whole. That's partly what is wrong with the CETA legislation. For example, Title I of CETA—points out some of the long-term dilemmas of how governments should work together. It's 100 percent federally financed. It often doesn't go through state legislative bodies. It doesn't go through some states where it is a Bureau of the Budget or OMB kind of clearance process. The money comes in; it flows out. Whatever bureaucrat we invented to become the manpower expert because we passed CETA, gets the money and writes a plan; often the plan is not in concert with the timing schedule of vocational education or the educational structures. On and on the story goes impeding coordination and cooperation.

The employment and training part of Title I of CETA includes a 5 percent set aside for vocational education, which is all financed through a very strange process. The money comes to the governor. Governors are not responsible for the education community. State boards of education or separately elected officials are responsible for that. That money passes over to that end of the structure, and then that structure finds its way down to the vocational education unit. Then it writes contracts with local prime sponsors, which are cities or counties of 100,000 population. Then they send all that back to a vocational education board who signs off on it and sends it back over to the governor who sends it in to the federal Department of Labor.

I'm not sure that we're going to see or that it makes a whole lot of sense to have a big superstructure in the sky, meaning at the federal government level, there are at least twenty-five different states that have gone through all kinds of reorganizations with what is called "under the span of and control of the executive branch of government." That hasn't resolved all the problems. I'm not convinced that any one superstructure is going to do it.

I think we need to perhaps focus more on what the educational structures can do on a long-term basis. If we have to continue to have in America, some kind of countercyclical economic stimulus,

set of programs I don't think you want to be highly involved in the administration of those programs. It would hurt your mission. If we also have to have another function as being the intermediaries, as the case of the CETA program, where we do such things as twenty-six weeks of on-the-job training, maybe those are the places where we can begin to define and clarify where the long-term educational employment development mission fits. That means, though, the education community, particularly the vocational education community, cannot continue to argue such nonsensical issues as "we're the only ones qualified to teach because we have more academic certificates." Asserting that you are the only ones qualified to teach is facetious because nobody is going to believe it. They're not going to believe it because old commissions like the Automation and Technology Commission of several years ago, proved that any person could learn his/her particular job. I understand that other studies have been done since that time which still basically support that. So some argue that what one needs from the education community is an aging and maturity "riot." The educational structure is not necessarily what one needs for developing technical skills of a particular job.

2. In areas such as the handicapped and other specialty concerns, how do we get groups to work together?

I only have one answer if we're not going to overthrow the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States is based upon fifty Constitutions of currently fifty states and the number may be fifty-four. There is a separate legislative branch at that level, and there is a chief executive branch at that level. I am not advocating the actions of all governors in the United States today, even though I work for them. I think, though, we need some midpoints between what goes on in the hallowed halls of Congress and what goes on out there in the state legislatures. We need to rethink and rework the entire management of our human resources programs. I hope this is done as President Carter goes through his reorganization because we've passed enough laws. For example, everybody, with the exception of the white Anglo-Saxon male between the ages of 25 and 45 who has not been a veteran, is a member of a legally protected group in this country. There's something very sad about that, that we have to keep passing civil rights laws for protection when, in fact, what we need to do is implement them.

We have to more clearly define the roles of the Office of Education Vocational Rehabilitation. We need to figure out now how to manage the systems and clearly define points of accountability. I think that is our task in the next three to five years. It is not romantic. It is not necessarily creative or innovative, and it might not be written up as a pretty little brochure saying this is what we did. But I think as public administrators that is clearly our responsibility. We may need more money, but as I listened and watched the debate on the new legislation, I wondered if it really needed to go for more jobs in the inner city. Some of it, yes, but should it all have gone there? And how would you define inner city? And how would you account for the kids in rural America. There's no easy way to get it out there. I think problems of management and development of infra-structures are what we have to address ourselves to.

A prime example of this is the welfare reform, a solution which President Carter submitted to Congress last Monday. This is a three-part piece of legislation, one of them we call the cash assistance side (the income maintenance side), the jobs side, and the third alters the tax structure. The jobs piece of legislation has not resolved one basic delivery system question. It has not resolved which level of government is expected to perform what function. It has not resolved roles and relationships of the educational community versus the job placement community. We did make some progress with the original design in which they were only going to train for eleven weeks. That was all that would be given. We can now place people in training for a minimum of one year as well as out on a job with no discrimination in terms of time commitments. We were going to discriminate against the people

who were in long-term training programs so we've made some progress. I don't know where the answers are, the legislative debate will either resolve or further obfuscate the problem.

3. What was the role of private enterprise in testifying on the Youth Employment Act?

The posture of the business community lobby per se focused and continues to focus on calling for subminimum wage for youth. When it came time to lobby for a specific piece of legislation, nobody was there. The unions were very much there. Some of the educational lobbyists were there. My organization was there. The fact was that we are supposed to get a special role for governors, and got it. I'm not sure that my participation in that debate particularly helps youth, but I'm not sure it hurts them either. I can argue fairly well that kids in state correctional institutions shouldn't be cut out of the program which they would have been otherwise. Or, there would have been no way you could've tied in, for example—and it is written into that part of the legislation—that governors are supposed to work with their state education communities to do new and innovative things in terms of career guidance and counseling programs. They're supposed to work with state apprenticeship councils and programs, etc.

So there are some things that need to go on at the state level that I don't apologize for. Private industry was not there. And don't expect them to be. Don't expect them to be there, for example, when they debate the welfare legislation on the minimum wage jobs for 1.4 million people in this country. Do not expect Congress to come up with any piece of legislation that has anything more than rhetoric that we should involve at the private sector in the development of jobs. It's an economic debate and belongs in other committees of Congress, but it's not really a debate that focuses on the redistribution of income for poor people in our country.

4. No one seems to discuss why we have youth unemployment? Why?

A year ago in the fall the National Manpower Commission sponsored a series of seminars around the country to deal with the problems of youth unemployment. I asked the question, "Why are we suddenly going around the country having all these meetings with the best 'brains' talking about youth unemployment?" The best answer I got was "Well, we had a foundation grant and they wanted to know what we could do about youth problems."

What did come out of those seminars, though, is that if we used our funds to target on the economically disadvantaged, we had a manageable number of young people falling below the poverty level income which could be served better. At the macronational level the estimates are 600,000 to 1 million young people are economically disadvantaged, and that is a manageable number of people to design a program for. Confusion arose when one started trying to do that as a part of the countercyclical economic stimulus program and with those 37 new bills that came out in Congress, we also began to confuse the pattern of focusing our resources on a particular portion of that population. There was serious concern about targeting all jobs training and jobs money for youth to the economically disadvantaged. The reason was that white Anglo-Saxon parents with the average income of around $15-20,000 a year had to send their children to school, and their kids were having a hard time getting involved in the private sector. And the parents were letting their congressmen know about that. So the bill is broader. We could've managed, and probably then some, with 600,000 to 1 million young people given all our resources if we're going to target the funds to basically the age group 16 to 21, and that it's all going to be for the economically disadvantaged. But that did not happen. Maybe it shouldn't have happened. The fact is, it could have waited, and obviously because we have a higher unemployment rate, trends always show that in a loose labor market the youths are always the last ones to be employed.

5. Would you comment on the future of CETA, given the advent of Title VI in the new Youth Employment Act? Is it moving to categorical programs?

The answer is clearly yes. It's moving to categorical programs, but in a different way than before. We are not going back to 10,000 contracts that are controlled through the federal bureaucratic structure. What we will see in the rewrite of CETA legislation next year is a variety of different titles. One of them will be a title for a jobs training program for the welfare population. We will continue to have a separate title for youth and you'll be able to do a wide range of services within that. You will probably have a title for the older worker after we decide the definition of the older worker. I've even been with some women's groups who want to have a title for women. I think the only possible way this could be countered is if we have a better track record, and we don't have. The state and local officials, while they have not been any worse than the old categorical programs, have not necessarily got any better. My friends from community action agencies and OICs and Urban Leagues don't like to hear that. The fact is, it's true. They have not done very well, for example, in terms of public jobs programs of targeting the funds to the economically disadvantaged, Title VI. But there's a fairly good reason for that. Congress did not intend for the original Title VI—the first thrust of that money—to be for the structurally unemployed. When they passed legislation it said somebody only had to be unemployed fifteen days before he/she was eligible for a Title VI public service job. I've worked for politicians at all levels, and that is open invitation. It is now much more targeted to long-term unemployed. The new targeting is now much more complicated when one tries to become specific in a piece of legislation and you have chaos when you try to implement it. For example, it says somebody was supposed to be unemployed at least fifteen weeks longer. That sounded very good. It also said welfare recipients were supposed to be given priority. What Congress didn't stop to think about is that there are fifty different definitions when one starts counting when he/she has been unemployed fifteen weeks. There are fifty different definitions of who is eligible for welfare. It was chaos at the local level. But the program is more targeted and will probably continue to be so.

6. Given current data demands, what can we expect data demands to be in 1982 for Congress?

I think the data demands for Congress are becoming fixational. As we become more and more successful by providing data, they want more and more data. And they want it broken down more and more again at varying levels. For example, in the youth legislation when they tacked on an additional $3 to $5 million for the National Occupational Information and Coordinating Committee and the State Occupational Information and Coordinating Committee's counterparts—that is an indicator anyway you look at it.

Those involved in data, I perceive, are going to be the major growth industries in the next five years partly as a result of many recommendations that will come out of Sar Levitan's commission and also because there is so much frustration. I think there's no question about that. What I am very afraid of is if you take the CETA systems, and employment service system, and the vocational education system, the sheer demands on everybody's time to implement the Vocational Education Act and certainly to implement this youth legislation, it will be very difficult to get anyone excited about the creative, wonderful things one can do, for example, within the State Occupational Information and Coordinating Committees. I have a very hard time catching anybody's attention about improving the data on a program when I'm getting a phone call from another side of the governor's office saying we're being sued by all of our local units of government because we're not providing adequate data for the allocation of funds. I think, quite frankly, first things first. We really have to make some decisions about how far down we should go in terms of collecting base data and what data should be used for allocations.

7. Do you feel the need to examine private enterprise and determine why these employers do not employ youth? And why weren't the business leaders present during the Youth Employment Act hearings?

The business leader was at the hearings but he/she was testifying at other committee meetings, not on the Education and Labor Committee in the House or the Human Resources Committee in the Senate. The reason is that those are the implementing committees, the authorization committees. They were testifying in Senate Finance, and House Ways and Means, and testifying on the tax bill. They came back to those committees when they were testifying on the subminimum wage. I don't want to indicate that there are not a lot of things that we don't need and should be doing at the local and state levels, but that's within the community. That's not with what to do in terms of passing legislation. The business persons don't really care whether it's the vocational education dollar, whether it's the CETA youth dollar, whether it's the employment service dollar, or who they interact with, because they don't really need to. What they're interested in at the congressional level is whether they can pose a better argument than the union person can about whether or not you go to private wage subsidies. But, they want to put some limits on that private wage subsidy.

They, for example, are not interested in seeing a tax incentive which we had in the work incentive program in welfare. That's proved to be failure. There are many pieces of research done on that tax incentive. If you ask an employer, particularly in a loose labor market, why he/she will not hire or place a welfare recipient in a job, he/she will say there's just not enough money in that current incentive that's going to get the business person to take on all the other problems that he/she perceives correctly or incorrectly with hiring the welfare recipient, particularly when he/she can hire through a gate process. And when it comes to a vocational education community or local technical advisory council, business leaders are not talking to you about serving a specific population of the economically disadvantaged. They are talking to you about how, overall, the population coming out of our collective school system meets their needs. When you start trying to get the private employers to sit down and really address the issue, of what we shall call the "significant segment"—anybody except the white Anglo-Saxon male, 25 to 45—they're just not going to pay attention. They'll pay attention when the affirmative action rules catch up with them. They'll pay attention when they're picketed by the handicapped. They'll pay attention when the women start boycotting. I perhaps am not being as positive as you want me to be in terms of what we can do with the business community. I don't think you can do a whole lot in national legislation for some very good economic reasons, so I'm not trying to pick on them. But it just doesn't work to get them involved in manpower vocational and training components that don't want to worry about women and young people right now. You don't create jobs, except in the public sector, through things we do within the employment and vocational training community.

8. Some advocates today state that regardless of how many individuals we train in vocational programs, the youth unemployment problem will not be solved due to lack of jobs. What do you think?

There are other ways to create jobs. You can create jobs in the public sector. I imagine if I asked how many of you believe the public sector should be the employer of last resort, and if I asked you a series of questions about who should have priority for those jobs, I'd have 150 different answers if there are 150 people in the room. We have a hard time coming to grip with the fact that we are not going to produce the jobs in the private sector that we need for the number of people who want to participate in the labor force.

9. Are there several highly skilled technical jobs going unfilled in the labor market?

My friends who are knowledgeable about industrial occupational mixes tell me there are a lot of jobs. There are a lot of highly skilled technical jobs going unfilled every day in this country. I guess that is partly another speech because one has to then analyze who traditionally has held those jobs, who in the unions closed the expansion of people being allowed to go into their apprenticeship programs, and other problems attached to that. The problem is we do not have a large number of the traditionally "acceptable" people who are unemployed. I'm not trying to pick on my white Anglo-Saxon friends, but there is not a high unemployment rate within that subset of our population. So we have to look to other subsets of the population to fill and be trained in those jobs. That's where we're caught. That's why every state in this nation has to prove and swear now in their vocational education plan that they will never discriminate in terms of sex stereotyping again, with all the implications attached thereof. The people who always filled those jobs don't have a high unemployment rate. So we have to be creative and turn to people who do have a high unemployment rate. And I think we need to get about the business of doing it. I don't mean to be flippant about the requirements of the sex education part. I happen to feel very strongly about that. I guess I've come to believe that passing something in legislation, certifying, writing off, and getting fifty signatures through a public hearing process or whatever it may need, doesn't do the job. It's a good start, but it doesn't solve our serious problem.

10. Comment on the potential of combining human resources training in the Department of Labor and USOE.

It will get serious consideration and debate. I think the debate is necessary and essential. I think that that whole debate may help us do what I think we need to do and that is to clarify where our missions do separate and then where they should mesh. The youth legislation is an example of the 5 percent set aside here and 22 percent set aside there. That's not the way to solve problems. I think that that debate is long overdue. I'm making a bet that any major reorganization will never happen because there are other forces that are overwhelming. For example, going back to the welfare reform debate and the focus on the redistribution of income in America as well as the development of a permanent public jobs program I think those forces will simply, at least for the next two or three years, prevent a combination.